



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,938	03/15/2004	G. Glenn Henry	CNTR.2072	1288

23669 7590 04/23/2008
HUFFMAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
1900 MESA AVE.
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80906

EXAMINER

LANIER, BENJAMIN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/23/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO@HUFFMANLAW.NET

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/800,938	Applicant(s) HENRY ET AL.	
	Examiner BENJAMIN E. LANIER	Art Unit 2132	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BENJAMIN E. LANIER. (3)_____.

(2) Richard K. Huffman. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 15 April 2008.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kessler.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Huffman discussed what Applicant believes to be the difference between a 'microprocessor' and a 'coprocessor'. Examiner stated that using a broad but reasonable interpretation, a 'coprocessor' was effectively a 'microprocessor'. Mr. Huffman discussed possible claim amendments to narrow the claimed microprocessor. No claim language was agreed upon.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Benjamin E Lanier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2132

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required